REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. Claim 1 has been amended herein. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by way of this amendment. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified application, in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 5-8 contain allowable subject matter, and would be allowable if claim 5 is rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Drawing Objections

The Office Action indicates that Fig. 2 has been objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.83(b) because they are allegedly incomplete. Specifically, the Office Action notes that in Fig. 2 element 22, "OCD" should be amended to recite "CCD". Applicants respectfully request approval of the proposed amended Fig. 2 (marked-up with red-ink) amended per the Examiner's suggestion. Also upon approval of the proposed drawing amendment, Applicants respectfully request substitution of the enclosed clean copy of amended Fig. 2 for the originally filed Fig. 2. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the objections to the drawings have been overcome.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2 and 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Noriaki, et al. (JP 10-271490) ("Noriaki"). Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 1 and the claims directly and indirectly dependent therefrom are not anticipated by the Noriaki, in view of the following remarks.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,:

> Display control means...wherein the display control means transforms the input image on the basis of the positional relationship between respective pixels of the output image to be displayed on the monitor and respective pixels of the input image corresponding to the output image.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Noriaki does not teach or suggest a display control means that transforms the input image on the basis of the positional relationship between the respective pixels of the output image to be displayed on the monitor and respective pixels of the input image corresponding to the output image, as recited in independent claim 1.

The Office Action alleges that Noriaki discloses, "display control means (15) for transforming an input image captured by the camera at a time vehicle is rolling backward into an output image that is assumed to be an image at a predetermined inclination at a virtual camera position different from an actual camera position, and displaying the output image on the monitor." (See, Office Action, page 3, ¶ 2.). However, Noriaki's system modifies an input image to correct for distortion due to the camera lens. This type of transformation is different from the claimed invention. Further, Noriaki's distortion correction process can be problematic if the output image is magnified. Specifically, the method Noriaki's system implements to magnify

would create an output image displayed on the monitor would have more pixels than the input image.

In contrast, the input image in independent claim 1 is transformed using a transformation table that is used to search for pixels of an input image at the "actual camera position" which correspond to pixels of an output image assumed to be obtained at the "virtual camera position" recited in amended claim 1. The pixels of the input image are therefore reverse mapped on the basis of the pixels of the output image. This means that all of the pixels of the output image can be properly mapped because the starting point of the mapping is the pixels of the output image.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention as recited in amended independent claim 1 is patentably distinct from the Noriaki, et al. patent's compensating for lens distortion. Applicants submit that claims 2 and 4, which are dependent on independent claim 1, are patentably distinct from the cited references for at least similar reasons. Therefore, Applicants request withdrawal of this ground of rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noriaki, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Choi (US Patent No. 5,121,200). Claims 9-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noriaki, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Atsushi (JP 11-016097). Claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noriaki, as applied to claim 1

above, and further in view of Atsushi and JP (01-147983A). Applicants submit that the Choi, Atsushi, or JP '983 patents do not teach or suggest a pixel transformation as recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the reasons discussed above regarding the deficiencies identified in Noriaki, with regard to independent claim 1, claims 3 and 9-12, which are directly or indirectly dependent on independent claim 1, are also patentably distinct from the cited reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these grounds of rejections.

CONCLUSION

It is now believed that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. In view of these remarks, an early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: June 25, 2004

By: Steven F. Meyer
Steven F. Meyer
Registration No. 35,613

Correspondence Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154
(212) 758-4800 (telephone)
(212) 751-6849 (facsimile)